

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/632,824

Applicant(s)

KURODA ET AL.

Examiner

Kallambella Vijayakumar

Art Unit

1751

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kallambella Vijayakumar.

(3) Mark Kopec.

(2) Stefan Koschmieder.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 February 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: ALL.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior Art of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Including three different elements in the oxide composition could overcome the prior art of record. A new search will be conducted to evaluate and confirm the patentability of these changes.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
Mark Kopec  
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 02/11/2004  
Examiner's signature, if required